PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

REC'D 0 8 FEB 200

MIDO PCT

			•		ANIBO		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Applicant's or 15818-26P	agent's file reference	FOR FURTHER AC	See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)				
International application Nó. PCT/CA 02/01677		International filing date (c 05.11.2002	day/month	vyear) .	r) Priority date (day/month/year 05.11.2002		
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification			nd IPC			· ·	
A61C13/00							
				•			•
Applicant					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	` · ·
CYNOVAD	INC. et al.			٠.	the second		
			···-				
This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.							
2. This REPORT consists of a total of 7 sheets, including this cover sheet.							
This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e. sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).							
These	annexes consist of a total of	of sheets.					,; ,
-					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	•						
3. This re	eport contains indications re	lating to the following ite	ms:	•	**		•
ΙÞ	Basis of the opinion			•			,
11 0	☐. Priority				. ,		
III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability.				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
IV 🖾 Lack of unity of invention			. •		0.00		
V							
VI E	Citations and explanations and explanations and explanations and explanations are citations.	-	tement		•	•	. 16' - 14
VII E	_	nternational application					er er jaren der
VIII È		on the international appli	cation		·		
VIII 2	J Certain Observations C	in the international appli	CallOff			• • •	
Date of submi	Date of submission of the demand Date of completion of this report						
Sale of destribution of the definant							
04.06.2004			02.02.2005				
	ailing address of the internation	al	Authoriz	ed Officer			nes Prim
preliminary examining authority: European Patent Office				٠	•		See Brown . 1 E
D-80298 Munich			Hagbe	rg, A			(0))
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465			Talanhoi	na No. 449.89 2	200.7422		

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY **EXAMINATION REPORT**

I. Basis of the report

International application No.

PCT/CA 02/01677

The standard Total State Commence of

Committee and the state of the

		••			
1.	the	e receiving Office in .	nents of the international application (response to an invitation under Article this report since they do not contain	14 are referred to in this reno	rt as "originally filed"
		:	·	•	•
	De	scription, Pages		the state of the state of	
	1-1	3	as originally filed		
	Cla	aims, Numbers		100	
	1-4		as originally filed		m e e e e e e
	Dra	awings, Sheets	e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	A Commence of the Commence of	
	1/8-	-8/8	as originally filed	Marine Control	W
2.	Wit	h regard to the lang guage in which the i	uage, all the elements marked above nternational application was filed, unle	were available or furnished to ess otherwise indicated under t	this Authority in the
	The	ese elements were a	available or furnished to this Authority	in the following language: 🦂 🚜	which is:
		the language of a t	ranslation furnished for the purposes	of the international search (und	der Rule 23:1(b))(-)
		•	blication of the international applicatio		· · · · ·
			ranslation furnished for the purposes		•
3.	Witl inte	h regard to any nuc rnational preliminan	leotide and/or amino acid sequence / examination was carried out on the l	disclosed in the international pasis of the sequence listing:	application, the
			ernational application in written form.		

The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.

The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence

Control of the second case 4. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

 \Box filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.

furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.

	the description,	pages:
	the claims,	Nos.:
□.	the drawings,	sheets:

listing has been furnished.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/CA 02/01677

 $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}} \cup \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$

	5. This report has been estable been considered to go beyon.	lished as if (some ond the disclosure	of) the amendments as filed (Rule 70.2(s had not bee c)).	n made, sin	ce they ha	₃ve'	
٠.	(Any replacement sheet co report.)						d to this	
	6. Additional observations, if neces	ssary:		**				
	IV. Lack of unity of invention							
	1. In response to the invitation to re	estrict or pay addit						
	restricted the claims.	odini, ido.		• • • •	٠.٠			
	☑ paid additional fees.	☑ paid additional fees.			••••			
					. 4			
					. · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•		
÷ . •	- House rectricted flot paid at				#			
: -		requirement of ur pplicant to restrict	nity of invention is 'ne or pay additional fe	ot complied w	ith and chos	e, accord	ing to	
· '3	. This Authority considers that the	Rule 68.1, not to invite the applicant to restrict or pay additional fees. This Authority considers that the requirement of unity of invention in accordance with Rules 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 seems.						
٠		•		, .	i i idies i.s.	r, ro.z and	1-13.3	
	□ complied with.				. 61	*1		
i,	□ wnot complied with for the following the following the second	owing reasons:	100000	40.	* 4 1.14	en jagonia		
٠	see separate sheet				Že a e			
4	Consequently, the following parts examination in establishing this re	al application were t	he subject of	internationa	l prelimina	ary: , · .		
	☐ all parts.			. f ·		••		
	∴ the parts relating to claims N	*						
	, we parto tolating to claims in	•	.: .			٠.		
, V .	Reasoned statement under Articitations and explanations sup	cle 35(2) with reg porting such state	jard to novelty, inv ement	entive step o	or industria	l applicat	oility;	
1.	Statement.			. 10.3	•••			
	Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims						
		No: Claims	1-32, 35-41	•			· · ·	
•	Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims No: Claims	1-32, 35-41	e				
	Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims No: Claims	.1-32, 35-41	an's s	60 S No. 30 S			
· 2.	Citations and explanations			.». ,				

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No. PCT/CA 02/01677

see separate sheet

the contract of the open and a

With the State of the State of

1 6 6 1 mm 1 1 4 mm

一概 (1995) (1995) (1995) (1995)

Re Item IV --

Lack of unity of invention

1. Reference is made to the following document:

D1: EP-A-1252867 (Cicero Dental systems) 30 October 2002

2. The present application does not meet the requirements of Rule 13, PCT, because it relates to four different inventions.

The different inventions are:

I. Claims 1-32: An method for designing a dental prosthesis

II. Claims 33: A computer readable memory

III. Claim 34: A computer data signal

IV. Claim 35-41: A system for designing a dental prosthesis

There are no technical features common between any of the inventions.

The inventions are furthermore directed to solve different technical problems, namely:

I. to simplify the computer aided design of a dental prosthesis

II. to store instructions

III. to transmit data

IV. to provide hardware modules for a computer system

A technical relationship involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features in the sense of Rule 13.2 PCT therefore does not exist between the aforementioned four inventions, and the requirement of unity of invention referred to in Rule 13.1 PCT is not fulfilled.

Hence, the different inventions are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (Rule 13.1 PCT).

Re Item V

Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or the industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

Claim 1 defines a method of computer-aided design of a dental prosthesis. D1 discloses such a method, namely (cf. abstract, page 2, lines 27-34, page 8. line 54 - page 11, line 13, claims 1-5, 9, 10, figures):

A method for designing a dental prosthesis, the method comprising: identifying a plurality of components of said dental prosthesis to be designed, each one of said plurality of components having a distinct function; designing each of said plurality of components separately using virtual tools to produce virtual designs and generating separate data sets, while maintaining a relative reference among said components in a common reference frame; and producing a dental prosthesis model data set representing said dental prosthesis using all of said separate data sets.

In particular, the layers of the tooth of D1 must be considered to be components of the tooth, and each layer is represented by a separate data set. Separate data sets for each component to be designed are inherent to computer aided design.

Hence, claim 1 does not meet the requirement of novelty (Article 33(2) PCT).

- 2. Claim 16, although phrased as an independent claim, defines all features of claim 1 and is therefore, according to Rule 6.4 PCT, dependent on claim 1.

 Dependent claims 2-32 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step (Article 33(2)(3) PCT), because these claims define well-known method steps practised by the skilled person in computer aided design of a dental prosthesis and in producing a dental prosthesis, which method steps, as far as they are not disclosed in D1 (passages as above), therefore define slight constructional changes in the method of claim 1 which come within the scope of the customary practice followed by persons skilled in the art, especially as the advantages thus achieved can readily be foreseen.
- 3. The present application further does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT; because the subject-matter of claim 35 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT. The document D1 (passages as above), discloses:

A system for designing a dental prosthesis, the system comprising:

a data store module for storing separately a plurality of components of said dental prosthesis to be designed, wherein a relative reference is maintained among said plurality of components in a common reference frame,

::,;

a designing module for designing each of said plurality of components separately using virtual tools to produce virtual designs of said plurality of components and generating separate data sets, and

an output module for associating each of said separate data sets together and outputting said separate data sets together to a manufacturing device. . .

In particular, the data store module, the designing module, and the output module of D1 are suitable for the said features (see also PCT international search and preliminary examination guidelines Part II, 5.24).

Hence, claim 35 does not meet the requirement of novelty (Article 33(2) PCT).

- 4. Dependent claim 36-41 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect de la compositiva del compositiva della composit not disclosed in D1 (passages as above), define slight constructional changes in the system of claim 35, which come within the scope of the customary practice followed by persons skilled in the art, especially as the advantages thus achieved can readily be foreseen.
 - 5. The attention of the applicant is further drawn to the fact that claims it and 16 do not meet the requirement of conciseness of Art. 6 and Rule 6.4 PCT.